Sectt. II-27—45,004—21-10-27.

Law (St) (1928) Department.

Mis SERIES.

G.O. No. 684

DATED 24.2.1928

---

[Despatch Abstract]

[illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] -
[illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] -
G.O. 507/28 on [illegible] - Rs.220/- sanctioned.

---

C.F. 30—10,000—7-8-26.

POLICE **DEPARTMENT.**

*Received* ..... 192 . *Registered* ..... 192 .

*Subject*

Legal assistance - M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur K. Nilakantan Nayar, Inspector of Police, South Kanara District - Payment of the cost of his defence in the civil suit brought against him - Sanction requested.

ENCLOSURES.
No. 2 (Misc.)
Spare copies

Re No. 457/Acct '26

*Station* Madras. , *Dated the* 16th January 1928.

From (Name) F.A. Hamilton, Esquire,

(Designation) Inspector-General of Police.

To The Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Judicial Department.

through the Accountant-General, Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to request Government to sanction an expenditure of Rs.220/- on account of the defence of the civil suit for damages amounting to Rs.1400/-, brought by one Paul Domingo Picardo against M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur K. Nilakantan Nayar, Inspector of Police, South Kanara District, in the Court of the District Munsif of Mangalore.

2. This suit was in respect of acts done by the Inspector of Police in his official capacity, and its defence at the public expense was sanctioned by me under Police Order 225, Volume I. The suit has been dismissed with costs, the plaintiff being ordered to pay the Inspector (defendant) Rs.91-4-0 for his cost - vide copies of the judgment and the decree

decree in the suit enclosed for perusal and return. I am satisfied that the action of the Inspector was bonafide in the discharge of his official duties. The suit was a well contested one, and in view of the great labour involved in the trial of the suit, the Vakil, who defended the Inspector, requests that an additional fee of Rs.50/- be paid to him. I recommend the payment of this as also the cost of defence of the Inspector as in the bill of cost (Copy enclosed). The pleaders' fee amounting to Rs.135/- is debitable to "24.b Administration of Justice - Law Officers - Honoraria - Voted - Fees to pleaders in civil and criminal cases etc.," and the remaining sum of Rs.85/- will be met from the additional appropriation applied for under "26.c- Police - District Executive Force - i District Police - Non-contract Contingencies - Voted - Miscellaneous" in my letter No.473/Bud. of 27, dated 7th December 1927. The cost awarded by the Court, namely, Rs.91-4-0, if and when recovered, will be credited to Government.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Inspr.-Genl. of Police.

S.G.M./12-1.

42

Bill for cost of defence in O.S.No.537/1926 on the file of the District Munsif, Mangalore.

---

| | Rs. | A. | P. |
|---|---|---|---|
| As per bill of Vakil Mr. A. Srinivasa Poi including his fee of Rs.70/-. | 109 | 2 | 0 |
| Fees claimed by Vakil Mr. M. Krishnan Nambiyar. | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Stamp for vakalat to Mr. M. Krishnan Nambiyar. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost of obtaining certified copy of an arrest card from the Sub Divisional Magistrate's Court, Mangalore. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| For obtaining copies of exhibits as required by Judgment. | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Batta for witnesses for days on which they were waiting to be examined. | 20 | 4 | 0 |
| Charges for taking copies of Judgment. | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Incidental and sundry expenses. | 3 | 9 | 0 |
| Total | 170 | 0 | 0 |

Rupees one hundred and seventy only.

Sd. K. Nilakantan Nair,
Inspector of Police,
Mangalore, 24-11-1927.

*****

for Inspr.-Genl. of Police.

S.G.M./12-1.

A.? 7018 43

2.2.28

No. Pol. P.A.356 OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL, MADRAS,

*Fort St. George,* 26th January *192* 8.

Enclosures. 24 sheets



Forwarded.

2. The Pleader's fee amounting to Rs.135/- ~~xxx~~ being the amount payable to pleaders not in Government service, is debitable to "Supplies and Services Miscellaneous" under "24-Administration of Justice-Law Officers-Reserved-Voted" and not to "Honoraria" as suggested by the Inspector General of Police.

Dy. Accountant-General.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government of Madras,
Judicial Department.

R.S. 26/1

Jud. Dept.

Law no

Law (Genl.) Dept.

From the Inspector General of Police Re. No. 451/ Genl. 26 dt. 16.1.28.

C. No: 701B. From the A.G. No. Pol. P.A. 356 dt. 26.1.28

GUARD FILE NO. 1609 JUDICIAL D.

Legal assistance. MRRy. Rao Bahadur K. Nilakantan Nayar - Inspector of Police South Kanara district.

U.S

The remarks of the judicial (Police) dept may be invited in the first instance.

6.2.28
Jud.

Hom
4.2.28.

6-2-28.

Judicial Dept.

ASST. SECY. TO GOVT. 6-FEB. 1928 CHIEF SECT.

U.S.

p. 3cf

The court has awarded cost of Rs. 91-4-0 including Pleader's fee of Rs. 70/-. The statement at p. 42 includes pleaders' fees of Rs. 70 & Rs. 15. Two vakils appeared for prosecution — vide M. at p. 3 cf. The J.C. says that in addition to this Rs. 50/- may be paid to the pleader who

R

defended the Inspector - M. at p. 2 C.F.
The other items billed for are incidental
to the suit
reasonable and may be accepted.
Submitted for orders. The A.G's proposal
may be supported in this Dept &
the file returned to Law.

Cr
4/42 Cr-

Yes. I have read the memorandum
dealing judgment with some interest
The Ct. is satisfied that the inspector
this case was free from blame.

Law.

M.J. 8.2.28

AG

Law (Genl) Dept

A draft order is drawn. It may issue
with the Concurrence of the Finance
dept.

CR
14/2

S
15/2/28

10.2.28

10.2.28

Law [illegible]

Jin / 10/2.

5358 R
15.2.28

ASSISTANT SECY TO GOVT
10 FEB 1928
LAW DEPT
16 FEB 19 28

Finance S.R.

The proposal is to sanction an expenditure of Rs 220/- as shown below in connection with the defence of M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur K. Vilakoman Nayar, Inspector of Police South Kanara district in O.S. No. 537/26 on the file of the 5th. Munsif Mangalore.

| | Amount claimed. | Amount allowed by the court. |
|---|---|---|
| Pleader's fee | Rs 85/- | Rs 85/- |
| Special fee | Rs 50/- | .. |
| Expenses | Rs 85/- | 6-4-0 |
| | Rs 220/- | 91-4-0 |

The Inspector General says that the suit was a well contested one and in view of the great labour involved in the trial of the suit he recommends an additional fee of Rs 50/- to the pleader who defended the Inspector. The Judl. dept. support the I. G's request. Submitted that Finance may agree to the payment of Rs 135/- being the pleader's fee and Rs 85/- being the expenses incurred by the Inspector in the conduct of the suit.

The draft order may be accepted.

21.2.28.

22/2/28.

Law

Law & Exmn Dept

The draft order may now issue.

Yes 22.2.28

22.2.28.

Z.G. 1093/B 23.2.28

5358-S&R
22.2.28

Scott II-5 (a)—38,004—26-10-27. (6)

31/2/28

Law (Genl)

DEPARTMENT.

| | Date. | Initials. |
|---|---|---|
| When received for Fair-copying. | | |
| When copied | 24/2 | |
| When examined | | |
| When signed | | |
| When despatched | | |

Legal assistance - MRRy. Rao Bahadur K. Nilakantan Nayar - Inspector of Police - South Kanara dist. - O.S. No: 537/26 on the file of the District Munsiff, Mangalore - Rs 220 - Sanctioned.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. ....., dated ..... 192 .

" " " " ..... " ..... 192 .

*READ ALSO* :—

C. No. From the P.G. of Police Re No. 451/Sec/26 dated 16-1-1928.

" " 701B " " A.G. Pol. P.A.356 " 26.1.1928

" " ..... " " ..... " ..... 192

ORDER.

No. 684, dated 24/2/1928

Mi

The Govt sanction an expenditure of Rs 220/(rupees two hundred and twenty) including Rs 135/- (rupees one hundred and thirty five) ~~only~~ as pleader's fees in connection with the defence of MRRy Rao Bahadur K. Nilakantan Nayar, Inspector of Police, South Kanara district in O.S. No: 537/26 on the file of the District Munsiff, Mangalore.

2. The pleader's fee should

be debited to "24. Administration - Law Officers - Supplies and Services - Miscellaneous" and the remaining Rs 85/- to 26-C. Police - District Executive Force - District Police - Non-contract Contingencies - Voted - Miscellaneous.

3. The costs awarded by the Court, Viz Rs 91-4-0 (rupees ninety one and annas four) should be credited to Govt when recovered.

18M 10.2.28

CR 14/2

DJR 15/2/28

DAK 10.2.28

To

The D.G of Police (with Mr 3-61.Cf. & A.G. this fin. M dt. 11-2-28)

& Finance Dept

DJR 25/2/28